arXiv:1703.02715v1 [q-fin.ST] 8 Mar 2017

Media Network and Return Predictability

Li Guo and Yubo Tao*

Singapore Management University

March 9, 2017

Abstract

Media news reveals soft information about economic linkages between firms that is not immediately incorporated into stock price. In this paper, we propose a novel measure for aggregate market risk based on news network and news tones, namely media connection index (MCI). We show that the change of MCI predicts a negative return with a higher in-sample and out-of-sample performance than average correlation index in Pollet and Wilson (2010). In addition, our findings are also statistically as well as economically significant even though we control for different economic predictors used in Goyal and Welch (2008). We also find this measure is capable of predicting cross-sectional stock returns sorted by B/M, size, momentum, industry, investment and profitability. Further analysis shows that the predictability of our measure mainly comes from the negative tones which is consistent with Tetlock (2007).

JEL Classification: G11, G12, G17.

Keywords: Return Predictability; Media Connection; Network Analysis; News Sentiment; Excess Market Return.

*Li Guo, Lee Kong Chian School of Business, Singapore Management University, 50 Stamford Road, Singapore 178899. Email: liguo.2014@pbs.smu.edu.sg. Yubo Tao, School of Economics, Singapore Management University, 90 Stamford Road, Singapore 178903. Email: yubo.tao.2014@phdecons.smu.edu.sg.

"No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main. " — John Donne.

"To develop a complete mind: Study the art of science; study the science of art. Learn how to see. Realize that everything connects to everything else." — Leonardo DaVinci

Economic linkages are shown to have a strong effect on stock returns in the past few years (see Cohen and Frazzini, 2008; Menzly and Ozbas, 2010; Scherbina and Schlusche, 2015, etc.). As quoted in Scherbina and Schlusche (2015), "a corporate news event likely affects not only the firm at the centre of the particular development but also a number of other companies with economic ties to the firm". Undoubtedly, this argument addresses the importance of economic linkage in being a channel for media news to take effect. However, what if the media news itself can form a linkage and serve as the intermediate for information to spread among firms? Consider an example that a piece of news mentions two stocks at the same time, and this is always the case in real life. This news, in fact, not only just conveys knowledge of media coverage, but also informs us there is a media linkage between these two stocks. This linkage, on the one hand, may indicate a possible price co-movement reflected by the soft information of news tones; on the other hand, it may also lead to investors' additional attention on attached stocks. We summarize these two effects as soft information comovement and investor sentiment comovement.

Specifically, we ask the question how market reacts to the change of media connection. Here, we use change of media network instead of original index due to news momentum effect (Hillert *et al.* (2014) and Wang *et al.* (2016)). Namely, media news has continuation and may have lead-lag effects on stock returns. In this case, the change of media network index is a more informative measure than the original one. Importantly, we expect this index negatively predicts future returns. On the one hand, media network reflects soft information about firm fundamentals and hence it shows similar effect as return based comovement measures. According to Pollet and Wilson (2010), if aggregate risk increases, then the discount rate for future expected cash flows on most assets, including the stock market, should increase as well. Holding expected future cash flows constant, higher fu-

ture expected returns induce an immediate fall in price, i.e., negative realized returns, or volatility feedback, as described by Campbell and Hentschel (1992). So, if stocks become more highly correlated due to an increase of media connection, volatility feed back generates negative stock returns on average. On the other hand, media news based network index also show sentiment comovement effect. In this case, media connection reveals additional attentions from investors, thus driving additional sentiment effect (Baker and Wurgler (2007), Baker and Wurgler (2006), Baker *et al.* (2012) and Huang *et al.* (2014)) of corresponding stocks. For instance, given two stocks, A and B, without media connection, share holder A (B) may only pay attention to stock A (B). Now, when both firm A and firm B are mentioned by the same news article, this news may draw shareholder A's (B's) attention to stock B (A). Due to sentiment effect, this additional attention is asymmetry to the good news and bad news. To take shareholder A as an example, if news has a high sentiment on firm B, it drives optimistic of shareholder A and he can simply long stock B to adjust his position. While due to short sell constraint, a pessimistic investor cannot short firm B stock when news story show a low sentiment on firm B. In this case, high media connection drives overprice of stock B, hence a lower future return.

On the top of this logic, we compose a novel media connection index based on media network and news tones to model the change of stock comovement as proxy of change of aggregate risk of the stock market. Based on this media connection index, we find that the change of aggregate media connection based on news tones predicts a negative return with a higher in-sample and out-of-sample performance than average correlation index in Pollet and Wilson (2010). In fact, we have documented 2.53% and 5.14% monthly in-sample and out-of-sample R^2s in OLS predictive regressions respectively. In addition, our findings are also statistically as well as economically significant even though we control for different economic predictors used in Goyal and Welch (2008). We have also tested the performance of our index in predicting returns during the recession and expansion periods documented by NBER. The results shows that our measure obtain larger and positive R^2s in recession periods comparing to average correlation measure. Further, we find the predictability of our measure mainly comes from the negative new tones which is consistent

with Tetlock (2007) in which he find negative tones are more informative. Lastly, we test the portfolio implications of media connection index across different investors with various risk aversion levels as well as different trading strategies. The empirical results show that the portfolios constructed based on media connection index obtain larger Sharpe ratios and certainty equivalent return gains than average correlation for mean-variance investors. It also shows that the stocks that are distressed (high book-to-market ratio), with high investment or past winners are more predictable by media connections, which indicates a strong predictive power as well.

In this paper, we shed new light upon a different aspect of media's role in return predictability. In the past decade, the literature that investigates the media's role in financial markets mainly examines how the pessimism sentiment revealed from the content is associated with stock prices. Tetlock (2007) presents that the linguistic tone, especially negative tones, can predict market excess returns. Tetlock *et al.* (2008) further explore the cross-section predictability of returns by processing firm-specific news. Similarly, Zhang *et al.* (2016) document a sector specific reaction based on their distilled sentiment measure. Jegadeesh and Wu (2013) further improves Tetlock (2007) by using a term weighting method of content analysis based on OLS and Naive Bayes, and they also find significant return predictability of news articles. Unlike these literature that focuses on extracting investors sentiment between the lines, our index is a risk measure based on news tones. We assume that the news tone co-movement provides information about future prices co-movement of stocks that connected by co-occurrence in news articles.

We also contribute to the literature that studies risk measures for financial markets. Pollet and Wilson (2010) proposed a risk measure by using average correlations of stock returns. They find this measure can predict positive monthly as well as quarterly market excess log returns. Chen and Petkova (2012) decomposed aggregate market variance into an average correlation component and an average variance component. They find the latter commands a negative price of risk in the cross-section of portfolios sorted by idiosyncratic volatility. Acharya *et al.* (2017) proposed a measure for systemic risk by defining marginal expected shortfall with net equity returns. Our measure distinguishes

those risk measures by involving soft information and investor sentiment of media news and it confirms our conjectures by showing strong return predictability.

Lastly, we contribute to the literature on application of network analysis in financial studies. Cohen and Frazzini (2008) and Menzly and Ozbas (2010) find that economic links among certain individual firms and industries contribute to cross-firm and cross-industry return predictability. They interpret their results as evidence of gradual information diffusion across economically connected firms, in line with the theoretical model of Hong and Valkanov (2007). Rapach *et al.* (2015) investigate the predictability of industry returns based on a wide array of industry interdependencies. Most recent, Härdle *et al.* (2016) propose a new method, Tail-Event driven NETwork risk, to detect risk network. Based on this measure, they provide direct evidence on tail event interdependencies of financial institutions. Some follow-up empirical studies include Chen *et al.* (2017), Chen *et al.* (2016) and Xu *et al.* (2016). Most related, Scherbina and Schlusche (2015) have provide empirical evidence that media news reveals additional linkages among individual stocks. They find the lagged return of stocks in the linked group according to media news can predict subsequent return of other stocks within the same group. Different from above literature, we are the first paper to construct the market wide network index and provide direct evidence on its market return predictability.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 1, we review the literature exploring media connections and media network in financial markets and explain why other measures may fail in capturing stock price co-movement. In section 2, we show our methodology for composing an aggregate measure of media connection which can overcome the deficit of other measures and describe our data sources. After that, we conduct some empirical tests and present our results in section 3. Lastly, we conclude in section 4.

1 Media Connection and Media Network

In this section, we review the literatures that study the impact of the media connections and media networks on financial and economic matters. On the top of that, we make a comparison between the media connection and other pairwise measures, such as simple correlation and distances, and we show that by looking at the stocks from a network angle, the media will provide us more soft information beyond just media coverage and news tones, e.g. interrelations, centrality, and determinants.

Media connection, by definition, is a connection that built via news stories which may through explicit mentions or implicit affections. The explicit mentions, also known as media co-occurrence, is the most natural way of formulating the connectivity of two entities. Özgür *et al.* (2008) first studied the social network inferred from the co-occurrence network of Reuters news. They show that the network exhibits small-world features with power law degree distribution and it provides a better prediction of the ranking on "importance" of people involved in the news comparing to other algorithms. Scherbina and Schlusche (2015) studied the cross-predictability of stock returns by identifying the economic linkage from co-mentions in the news story. They constructed a linkage signal using the weighted average of the connected stock returns and they find that the linked stocks cross-predict one anothers returns in the future significantly, and the predictability increases with the number of the connected news.

Apart from the explicit mentions, the connection may also be built through implicit affections. One of the most popular channels is the industrial chain. As shown in Cohen and Frazzini (2008), economic links among certain individual firms and industries contribute significantly to cross-firm and cross-industry return predictability. Rapach *et al.* (2015) extends the perspective of Cohen and Frazzini (2008) by defining a connection between industries with the predictability of returns. Through these industrial interdependencies, the news that conveys information on one industry will also percolates into the other industries. Further, due to the competitive relation of stocks within the industry, the good (bad) news to one stock will be bad (good) news to its competitors. In addition, business interaction is another important channel that transfers news information from one firm

to another.

Based on media connections, we can formulate a media network by taking the whole picture of the connected stocks as a connected graph with news tones tagged on each stocks. The inter-relationships between stocks are presented by the aggregated connection scores. Different from correlation, the connection score is only a measure of concurrent relationship, which does not depend on the outside information. To see that, we consider the following example: suppose there are two connected news for two stocks, and the news tones for each stock is given by:

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ stock_1 \\ stock_2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cc} news_1 & news_2 \end{array} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0.8 & 0.2 \\ 0.2 & 0.8 \end{bmatrix} \end{array}.$$

where a positive number indicates a positive news tone for this stock. By cross-section correlation, we will have the correlation between the stocks is -1. However, this is not true. As we can see, the news tones for these stocks are all positive in both news, which may indicates a positive co-movement relationship. Therefore, correlation coefficient is not a proper tool for describing the news connectivities based on this simple example.

As simple correlation fails in describing media connections, people may come up with Euclidean distance. However, distance is incapable of capturing the sentiment information in news tones, and the following example explains our point.

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ stock_1 \\ stock_2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cc} news_1 & news_2 \end{array} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0.2 & 0.1 \\ -0.2 & -0.3 \end{bmatrix} \end{array}, \qquad \begin{array}{c} \\ stock_3 \\ stock_4 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cc} news_3 & news_4 \end{array} \\ \begin{bmatrix} -0.6 & -0.5 \\ -0.2 & -0.1 \end{bmatrix} \end{array}$$

For above cases, the Euclidean distance informs us that the distance between these two pairs of stocks are the same. However, we can deduce that the prices of stock 3 and 4 are likely to be co-moving while the prices of stock 1 and 2 may be affected oppositely. As a result, a proper connection score that can correctly reflect the relationship between connected stocks based on the news tones is needed, and we will show that our construction

of connection scores will be able to retain the information given in the news completely in the next section.

2 Data and Methodology

In this section, we introduce the data sources and explain the methodology for constructing the media connection index. Beyond that, we further explains the differences between the average correlation index in Pollet and Wilson (2010) and the advantages of our measure over theirs.

The data we use for identifying media connection is the firm-specific news from the Thomson Reuters News Archive dataset ranging from Jan-1996 to Dec-2014. The data contains various types of news, e.g. reviews, stories, analysis and reports etc., about markets, industries and corporations. In this paper, we identify the news that has mentioned at least two stocks as connected news and the others as self-connected news. This dichotomy allows us to isolate the effect of the media connection by calculating the connectivity measure with one stock as the centre of a news network, and the aggregation of connectivity measures over the whole portfolio will provide information on the whole news network.

Assumption 1 (First-degree Network)**.** *The information that the news conveys only affects the directly connected stocks.*

Assumption 2 (Majority Opinion)**.** *The aggregated news tones reflect the majorities' opinions on future prices of both connected stocks.*

The media connection is identified though the connected news where at least two stocks are mentioned in the text. Beyond just connectivity, the Thomson Reuters news data also provide us the news tones (positive, negative and neutral) for each mentioned stocks within each article. On the top of that, we can compute the daily pairwise connection scores of the news to each stock mentioned, that is,

$$CS^k_{i,j,t} = Tone^k_{i,t} \times Tone^k_{j,t}, \text{ with } i, j = 1, 2, \cdots, N, \text{ and } k = 1, 2, \cdots K_t. \tag{2.1}$$

where N is the total number of stocks in the sample, the superscript k denotes the kth news in day t and K_t is the total number of news of day t which may vary everyday. By construction, the connection score is positive when the news tones of the stocks are the same which indicates a possible co-movement of the stock prices. Further, the magnitude of the connection score implies the strength of the connection which ranges from -1 to 1. With a higher magnitude, the connection of the two stocks will be tighter and a more synchronized movement will occur.

With these basic elements available, we construct the *Media Connectivity Matrix* on daily basis

$$C_t = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{k=1}^{K_t} CS_{1,1,t}^k & \sum_{k=1}^{K_t} CS_{1,2,t}^k & \cdots & \sum_{k=1}^{K_t} CS_{1,N,t}^k \\ \sum_{k=1}^{K_t} CS_{2,1,t}^k & \sum_{k=1}^{K_t} CS_{2,2,t}^k & \cdots & \sum_{k=1}^{K_t} CS_{2,N,t}^k \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sum_{k=1}^{K_t} CS_{N,1,t}^k & \sum_{k=1}^{K_t} CS_{N,2,t}^k & \cdots & \sum_{k=1}^{K_t} CS_{N,N,t}^k \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2.2}$$

By construction, the media connectivity matrix have included all the information that a media network can provide us, and it is different with news coverage and average correlation in several aspects. Firstly, the off-diagonal elements in the matrix provides us the information on the closeness of each stocks on the news tones while the diagonal elements inform us the degree of self-connection. Further, despite the news may debate on the effects of some events happened to certain stocks, the aggregation of the connection score will reflect the opinions of the majority and therefore make the right prediction of the co-movement. This property differs from the correlation, and can be seen from the following example. Assume that

Based on the connnectivity matrix, we finally aggregate the network information to compose a *Media Connection Index* (MCI) on daily basis,

$$MCI_t = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j \neq i}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{K_t} CS_{i,j,t}^k}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{K_t} CS_{i,j,t}^k}. \tag{2.3}$$

This formulation frees us from the effect of media coverage and just measures the fraction of the media connections scaled by the news tones, which proxies the media interaction between the stocks. In Figure 1, we plot both media connection index we constructed and the average correlation index by Pollet and Wilson (2010) from 1996 to 2014.

[Insert Figure 1 here.]

From the figure we can observe that our index behaves in the same trend with average correlation index in general. This indicates that our media network index shares some information in average correlation. Furthermore, media network index is more volatile that average correlation index during the recession periods while maintaining the same fluctuation as average correlation over expansion periods. This nice feature is driven by the soft information that involved in the media news and it distinguishes our media based measure with price based measures.

Apart from the media news data, we also collect 12 economic predictors that are linked directly to economic fundamentals from Amit Goyal's website for comparison purposes. Specifically, they are the log dividend-price ratio (D/P), log dividend yield (D/Y), log earnings-price ratio (E/P), log dividend payout ratio (D/E), stock return variance (SVAR), book-to-market ratio (B/M), Treasury bill rate (TBL), long-term bond yield (LTY), long-term bond return (LTR), term spread (TMS), default yield spread (DFY), default return spread (DFR). The basic summary statistics of these predictors are reported in Table 1.

[Insert Table 1 here.]

From the summary statistics we can observe that the monthly excess market return has a mean of 0.66% and a standard deviation of 5.32%, implying a monthly Sharpe ratio of 0.12. While the excess market return has little autocorrelation, most of other variables are quite persistent. The summary statistics are generally consistent with the literature.

3 Predicting Stock Market Returns with Media Connection

In this section, we provide a number of empirical results. Section 3.1 examines the predictability of media network index and average correlation index on the aggregate market. Section 3.2 compares the media network index with economic predictors. Section 3.3 analyzes the out-of-sample predictability, Section 3.4 assesses the economic value of predictability via asset allocation and Section 3.5 investigates the predictability of characteristics portfolios.

3.1 Forecasting the Market

Consider the standard predictive regression model,

$$R^m_{t+1} = \alpha + \beta \Delta MCI^k_t + \epsilon_{t+1}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $k \in \{opt, pos, neg\}$, and R^m_{t+1} is the excess market return, i.e., the monthly log return on the S&P 500 index in excess of the risk-free rate. ΔMCI^{opt}_t is the change of Media network index based on optimism score. Similarly, ΔMCI^{pos}_t (ΔMCI^{neg}_t) is the change of Media network index based on positive (negative) score. For comparison, we also construct average correlation measure according to Pollet and Wilson (2010), AC_t. The null hypothesis of interest is that media connection has no predictive ability, $\beta = 0$. In this case, (3.1) reduces to the constant expected return model, $R^m_{t+1} = \alpha + \epsilon_{t+1}$. As finance theory suggests a negative sign of β, we test $H_0 : \beta = 0$ against $H_A : \beta < 0$, which is closer to theory than the common alternative of $\beta \neq 0$.

[Insert Table 2 here.]

Table 2 reports the results of the predictive regression. Panel B provides the estimation results for the average correlation index (AC_t and ΔAC_t). Consistent with Pollet and Wilson (2010), AC_t positively predicts future stock returns, which means when systematic

risk increases, risk-averse investors require a higher risk premium to hold aggregate wealth, and the equilibrium expected return must rise. However, we do not observe a significant negative effect from ΔAC_t on future return. According to Pollet and Wilson (2010), If an increase in average correlation is due to an increase in aggregate risk, then the discount rate for future expected cash flows on most assets, including the stock market, should increase as well. Holding expected future cash flows constant, higher future expected returns will induce an immediate fall in price, i.e., negative realized returns, or volatility feedback, as described by Campbell and Hentschel (1992). Therefore, if stocks are more correlated with each other, volatility feedback will generate negative stock returns on average. Indeed, we use ΔMCI_t^{opt} to proxy the change of aggregate risk and find it negatively predict future stock returns significantly. With the standard OLS estimation, ΔMCI_t^{opt} has an estimated coefficient of -0.85 that is statistically significant at the 5% confidence level.

Economically, the OLS coefficient suggests that a one-standard deviation increase in ΔMCI_t^{opt} is associated with a 0.85% decrease in expected excess market return for the next month. On the one hand, recall that the average monthly excess market return during our sample period is only 0.66%, thus the slope of 0.85% implies that the expected excess market return based on ΔMCI_t^{opt} varies by about 1.3 times larger than its average level, which indicates a strong economic impact. On the other hand, if we annualize the 0.85% decrease in one month by the multiplication of 12, the annualized level of 10.2% is somewhat large. In this case, one may interpret this as the model implied expected change that may not be identical to the reasonable expected change of the investors in the market. Empirically, this level is comparable with conventional macroeconomic predictors. For example, a one-standard-deviation increase in the D/P ratio, the CAY and the net payout ratio tends to increase the risk premium by 3.60%, 7.39%, and 10.2% per annum, respectively (see, e.g. Lettau and Ludvigson (2001) and Boudoukh *et al.* (2007)).

Meanwhile, the R^2 of ΔMCI_t^{opt} with OLS forecast is 2.53%, which is substantially greater than 1.16% of AC_t. This implies that if this level of predictability can be sustained

out-of-sample, it will be of substantial economic significance (Kandel and Stambaugh (1996)). Indeed, Campbell and Thompson (2008) show that, given the large unpredictable component inherent in the monthly market returns, a monthly out-of-sample R^2 of 0.5% can generate significant economic value and our findings in section 3.3 are consistent with this argument.

To figure out the driving force of the predictability, we also calculate media connection index based on negative and positive tones and re-estimate model (3.1) respectively. We find that the main prediction power of media connection index is from negative tone whose t-statistic is -2.02 with R^2 being 1.80% while the positive tone has no significant prediction power on future returns. This result is consistent with Tetlock *et al.* (2008) who assert the negative tone is more informative than the positive tone, and our findings complete their argument in the media network aspect.

Apart from just analyse the predictability over the whole period, it is also important to analyse the predictability during business-cycles to gain a better understanding about the fundamental driving forces. Following Rapach *et al.* (2010), we compute the R^2 statistics separately for economic expansions (R^2_{up}) and recessions (R^2_{down}),

$$R^2_c = 1 - \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T} I_t^c(\epsilon_t)^2}{\sum_{t=1}^{T} I_t^c(R_t^m - \bar{R}^m)^2}, \quad c \in \{up, down\}, \tag{3.2}$$

where I_t^{up} (I_t^{down}) is an indicator that takes a value of one when month t is in an NBER expansion (recession) period and zero otherwise; ϵ_t is the fitted residual based on the in-sample estimates of the predictive regression model in (3.1); $\bar{R}^m$ is the full-sample mean of R_t^m; and T is the number of observations for the full sample. Note that, unlike the full-sample R^2 statistic, the R^2_{up} (R^2_{down}) have no sign restrictions. Columns 4 and 5 of Table 2 report the R^2_{up} and R^2_{down} statistics. It is shown that ΔMCI_t^{opt} gains a higher the return predictability over recessions while AC_t is higher over expansions, and this suggests that media news may reflect some soft information that is different from stock prices.

Summarizing Table 2, the change of media network index, ΔMCI_t^{opt} exhibits signifi-

cant in-sample predictability for the monthly excess market return both statistically and economically, which is much stronger than the average correlation index. In addition, media network index performs much better in the recession periods while average correlation outperforms during the expansions. This suggests that media news reflects different information from stock prices for predicting market returns.

3.2 Comparison with Economic Predictors

In this section, we compare the forecasting power of media network index ΔMCI_t^{opt} with economic predictors and examine whether its forecasting power is driven by omitted economic variables related to business cycle fundamentals or changes in investor risk aversion. Basically, we ask the question whether the forecasting power of ΔMCI_t^{opt} remains significant after controlling for economic predictors. To analyse the marginal forecasting power of ΔMCI_t^{opt}, we conduct the following bivariate predictive regressions based on ΔMCI_t^{opt} and Z_t,

$$R_{t+1}^m = \alpha + \beta \Delta MCI_t^{opt} + \phi Z_t + \epsilon_{t+1}, \tag{3.3}$$

where Z_t is one of 12 economic predictors described in section 2, and our main interest is the coefficient of ΔMCI_t^{opt}, β, and to test $H_0 : \beta = 0$ against $H_A : \beta < 0$.

[Insert Table 3 here.]

Table 3 shows that the estimates of β in (3.3) are negative and large, in line with the results of predictive regression (3.1) reported in Table 2. More importantly, β remains statistically significant when augmented by the economic predictors. These results demonstrate that ΔMCI_t^{opt} contains sizeable complementary forecasting information beyond what is contained in the economic predictors. Meanwhile, average correlation index loses its prediction power after controlling for all 3 media connection indices, suggesting that news based predictor is more informative than aggregate risk measure.

3.3 Out-of-sample Forecasts

Despite that the in-sample analysis provides more efficient parameter estimates and thus more precise return forecasts by utilizing all available data, Goyal and Welch (2008), among others, argue that out-of-sample tests seem more relevant for assessing genuine return predictability in real time and avoid the over-fitting issue. In addition, out-of-sample tests are much less affected by finite sample biases such as the Stambaugh bias (Busetti and Marcucci (2013)). Hence, it is essential to investigate the out-of-sample predictive performance of media network index.

For out-of-sample forecasts at time t, we only use information available up to t to forecast stock returns at $t+1$. Following Goyal and Welch (2008), Kelly and Pruitt (2013), and many others, we run the out-of-sample analysis by estimating the predictive regression model recursively based on different measures of media connection indices,

$$\hat{R}^m_{t+1} = \hat{\alpha}_t + \hat{\beta}\Delta MCI^k_{1:t;t} \tag{3.4}$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_t$ and $\hat{\beta}_t$ are the OLS estimates from regressing $\{R^m_{s+1}\}^{t-1}_{s=1}$ with model 3.1 recursively. Like our in-sample analogues in Table 2, we consider the media network indices based on optimism, positive and negative news tones respectively. For comparison purposes, we also carry out out-of-sample test with AC_t and ΔAC_t, and the results are reported in Panel B of Table 4.

To evaluate the out-of-sample forecasting performance, we apply the widely used Campbell and Thompson (2008) R^2_{OS} statistic, the Diebold and Mariano (2002) t-statistic modified by McCracken (2007), and the Clark and West (2007) MSFE-adjusted statistic. The R^2_{OS} statistic measures the proportional reduction in mean squared forecast error (MSFE) for the predictive regression forecast relative to the historical average benchmark. Goyal and Welch (2008) show that the historical average is a very stringent out-of-sample benchmark, and individual economic variables typically fail to outperform the historical average. To compute R^2_{OS}, let p be a fixed number chosen for the initial sample training, so that the future expected return can be estimated at time $t = p+1, p+2, ..., T$.

Then, we compute $q = T - p$ out-of-sample forecasts: $\{\hat{R}^m_{t+1}\}_{t=p}^{T-1}$. More specifically, we use the data over 1996:01 to 2000:12 as the initial estimation period so that the forecast evaluation period spans over 2001:01 to 2014:12.

$$\hat{R}^2_{OS} = 1 - \frac{\sum_{t=p}^{T-1}(R^m_{t+1} - \hat{R}^m_{t+1})^2}{\sum_{t=p}^{T-1}(R^m_{t+1} - \bar{R}^m_{t+1})^2}, \tag{3.5}$$

where $\bar{R}^m_{t+1}$ denotes the historical average benchmark corresponding to the constant expected return model ($R^m_{t+1} = \alpha + \epsilon_{t+1}$), i.e.

$$R^m_{t+1} = \frac{1}{t}\sum_{s=1}^{t} R^m_s. \tag{3.6}$$

By construction, the R^2_{OS} statistic lies in the range $(-\infty, 1]$. If $R^2_{OS} > 0$, it means that the forecast $\hat{R}^m_{t+1}$ outperforms the historical average R^m_{t+1} in terms of MSFE.

The second statistic we report is Diebold and Mariano (2002) statistic modified by McCracken (2007) (DM-test hereafter), which tests for the equality of the mean squared forecast errors (MSFE) of one forecast relative to another. Our null hypothesis here is that the historical average has a MSFE that is not greater than that of the predictive regression model. However, to compare a predictive regression forecast with the historical average entails comparing nested models, as the predictive regression model reduces to the historical average under the null hypothesis. McCracken (2007) shows that the modified DM-test statistic follows a non-standard normal distribution when testing nested models, and provides bootstrapped critical values for the non-standard distribution.

The third statistic is the MSFE-adjusted statistic of Clark and West (2007) (CW-test hereafter). It tests the null hypothesis that the historical average MSFE is not greater than the predictive regression forecast MSFE against the one-sided (right-tail) alternative hypothesis that the historical average MSFE is greater than the predictive regression forecast MSFE, corresponding to $H_0 : R^2_{OS} \leq 0$ against $H_A : R^2_{OS} > 0$. Clark and West (2007) show that the test has a standard normal limiting distribution when comparing forecasts from the nested models. Intuitively, under the null hypothesis that the constant

expected return model generates the data, the predictive regression model produces a noisier forecast than the historical average benchmark as it estimates slope parameters with zero population values. We thus expect the benchmark models MSFE to be smaller than the predictive regression model's MSFE under the null. The MSFE-adjusted statistic accounts for the negative expected difference between the historical average MSFE and predictive regression MSFE under the null, so that it can reject the null even if the R^2_{OS} statistic is negative.

[Insert Table 4 here.]

Panel B of Table 4 shows that the return based AC_t and ΔAC_t index generates a negative R^2_{OS} statistic (-9.92 and -7.73 respectively) and thus delivers a higher MSFE than the historical average. Indeed, the estimation difference between price based measures and historical average are not significant according to both DM- and CW-test statistics. Thus, AC_t and ΔAC_t have weak out-of-sample predictive ability for the aggregate stock market, confirming our previous in-sample results (Table 2). In the contrary, ΔMCI_t^{opt} exhibits much stronger out-of-sample predictive ability for the aggregate market. Its R^2_{OS} is 5.14% and its DM- and CW-test statistics are 1.36 and 1.75, which suggest that ΔMCI_t^{opt}'s MSFE is significantly smaller than that of the historical average at the 10% or lower significance level.

In addition, the sixth and seventh columns of Table 4 show that, while the predictability of media network indices are only concentrated in recessions, ΔMCI_t^{neg} presents strong out-of-sample forecasting ability during both expansions and recessions. Besides, ΔMCI_t^{opt} seems not performing well during expansions in comparison with ΔMCI_t^{neg}, which also support Tetlock *et al.* (2008) that negative tone is more informative than positive tone of media news.

[Insert Figure 2 here.]

Since both AC_t and ΔMCI_t^{opt} can be proxy of aggregated market risk, their economic

sources of predictability are likely the same. To understand their differences in forecasting power, Figure 2 depicts the predicted returns based on AC_t and ΔMCI_t^{opt} for the 2001:01–2014:12 out-of-sample period. It is clear that the ΔMCI_t^{opt} predicted returns are much more volatile than the AC_t forecasts. As the actual realized excess returns (plotted in the figure as 6-month moving average for better visibility) are even more volatile than the ΔMCI_t^{opt} predicted returns. This explains why the media news based index does a better job than the return based correlation approach here in capturing the expected variation in the market return.

Following Goyal and Welch (2008) and Rapach *et al.* (2010), Figure 3 presents the time-series plots of the differences between cumulative squared forecast error (CSFE) for the historical average benchmark forecasts and the CSFE for predictive regression forecasts based on ΔMCI_t^{opt} and AC_t over 2001:01–2014:12. This time-series plot is an informative graphical device on the consistency of out-of-sample forecasting performance over time. When the difference in CSFE increases, the model forecast outperforms the historical average, while the opposite holds when the curve decreases. It thus illustrates whether ΔMCI_t^{opt} and AC_t based forecasts have a lower MSFE than the historical average for any particular out-of-sample period.

[Insert Figure 3 here.]

The solid line in Figure 3 shows that our media network index, ΔMCI_t^{opt} consistently outperforms the historical average except for the end of 2011. The curve has slopes that are predominantly positive, indicating that the good out-of-sample performance of ΔMCI_t^{opt} steps from the whole sample period rather than some special episodes. The figure also graphically illustrates the performances over the NBER dated business cycles, complementing Table 4. For comparison, the dashed line plots the difference in CSFE for the average correlation index. The dashed line shows that AC_t fails to consistently outperform the historical average. In a result, it does a poor job in terms of monthly out-of-sample forecasts. The curve is negatively sloped almost in the whole sample period which suggests return based measure may contain a lot of noise for the in-sample forecasts.

Overall, Table 4 shows that ΔMCI_t^{opt} is a powerful and reliable predictor for the excess market returns, and consistently outperforms AC_t across different sample periods.

In summary, out-of-sample analysis shows that the ΔMCI_t^{opt} displays strong out-of-sample forecasting power for the aggregate stock market. In addition, ΔMCI_t^{opt} substantially outperforms the average correlation index in an out-of-sample setting, consistent with our previous in-sample results (Tables 2 and 3).

3.4 Asset Allocation Implications

Now we examine the economic value of stock market forecasts based on the media network index, ΔMCI_t^{opt}. Following Kandel and Stambaugh (1996), Campbell and Thompson (2008) and Ferreira and Santa-Clara (2011), among others, we compute the certainty equivalent return (CER) gain and Sharpe Ratio for a mean-variance investor who optimally allocates across equities and the risk-free asset using the out-of-sample predictive regression forecasts.

At the end of period t, the investor optimally allocates

$$w_t = \frac{1}{\gamma} \frac{\hat{R}_{t+1}^{ms}}{\hat{\sigma}_{t+1}^2} \tag{3.7}$$

of the portfolio to equities during period $t+1$, where γ is the risk aversion coefficient, $\hat{R}_{t+1}^{ms}$ is the out-of-sample forecast of the simple excess market return, and $\hat{\sigma}_{t+1}^2$ is the variance forecast. The investor then allocates $1 - w_t$ of the portfolio to risk-free assets, and the $t + 1$ realized portfolio return is

$$R_{t+1}^p = w_t R_{t+1}^{ms} + R_{t+1}^f, \tag{3.8}$$

where R_{t+1}^f is the gross risk-free return. Following Campbell and Thompson (2008), we assume that the investor uses a five-year moving window of past monthly returns to estimate the variance of the excess market return and constrains w_t to lie in between 0 and 1.5 to exclude short sales and to allow for at most 50% leverage.

The CER of the portfolio is

$$CER = \hat{u}_p - 0.5\gamma\hat{\sigma}_p^2, \tag{3.9}$$

where $\hat{u}_n$ and $\hat{\sigma}_n^2$ are the sample mean and variance for the investors portfolio over the q forecasting evaluation periods respectively. The CER gain is the difference between the CER for the investor who uses a predictive regression forecast of market return generated by 3.4 and the CER for an investor who uses the historical average forecast. We multiply this difference by 12 so that it can be interpreted as the annual portfolio management fee that an investor would be willing to pay to have access to the predictive regression forecast instead of the historical average forecast. To examine the effect of risk aversion, we consider portfolio rules based on risk aversion coefficients of 1, 3 and 5, respectively. In addition, we also consider the case of 50bps transaction costs which is generally considered as a relatively high number.

For assessing the statistical significance, we follow DeMiguel *et al.* (2009) by testing whether the CER gain is indistinguishable from zero by applying the standard asymptotic theory as in their paper. In addition, we also calculate the monthly Sharpe ratio of the portfolio, which is the mean portfolio return in excess of the risk-free rate divided by the standard deviation of the excess portfolio return. Following again DeMiguel *et al.* (2009), we use the approach of Jobson and Korkie (1981) corrected by Memmel (2003) to test whether the Sharpe ratio of the portfolio strategy based on predictive regression is statistically indifferent from that of the portfolio strategy based on historical average.

[Insert Table 5 here.]

Table 5 shows that the AC_t index generates small economic gains for a mean-variance investor, consistent with the small R^2_{OS} statistics in Table 4. Specifically, AC_t has a negative CER gain of -1.11% and -2.14% when the risk aversion is 3 and 5 respectively, and small positive CER gains of 1.40% when the risk aversions is 1. The net-of-transactions-costs CER gains for AC_t is even lower, with 1.27% for risk aversion equals 1. The Sharpe

ratios of the portfolios using AC_t range from 0.07 to 0.09 in all cases.

Of all the media network indices, ΔMCI_t^{opt} stands out again in term of the economic value. The CER gains for ΔMCI_t^{opt} across the risk aversions are consistently positive and economically large, ranging from 1.85% to 4.04%. More specifically, an investor with a risk aversion of 1, 3, or 5 would be willing to pay an annual portfolio management fee up to 4.04%, 2.58%, and 1.85%, respectively, to have access to the predictive regression forecast based on ΔMCI_t^{opt} instead of using the historical average forecast. The net-of-transactions-costs CER gains of the ΔMCI_t^{opt} portfolios range from 1.25% to 3.49%, well above AC_t, and is of economic significance. The Sharpe ratios of portfolios formed based on ΔMCI_t^{opt} range from 0.19 to 0.21, which more than 66% of the market Sharpe ratio, 0.12, with a buy-and-hold strategy. In addition, all the CER gains and Shape ratio gains of ΔMCI_t^{opt} in all the risk aversion cases are statistically significant.

Overall, Table 5 demonstrates that the media network index, ΔMCI_t^{opt} can generate sizable economic value for a mean-variance investor, while AC_t cannot. The results are robust to common risk aversion specifications and the same level of transaction cost.

3.5 Forecasting Characteristics Portfolios

Media connection has different impacts on different stocks. In particular, stocks that are large, with high media coverage, and in the central position are likely to be more sensitive to media news connection. In this subsection, we investigate how well the media network index ΔMCI_t^{opt} can forecast portfolios sorted on book-to-market, size, momentum, industry, investment and profitability. This study not only helps to strengthen our previous findings for aggregate stock market predictability, but also helps to enhance our understanding for the economic sources of return predictability.

Consider the predictive regression,

$$R_{t+1}^j = \alpha_j + \beta_j \Delta MCI_t^{opt} + \epsilon_{t+1}^j, \quad j = 1, \cdots, 10, \tag{3.10}$$

where R_{t+1}^j is the monthly excess returns for the 10 size, 10 book-to-market, 10 momen-

tum, 10 industry, 10 investment and 10 profitability portfolios, respectively, with the null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$ against the alternative hypothesis $H_A : \beta_j < 0$ based on wild bootstrapped p-values.

[Insert Table 6 here.]

Panel A of Table 6 reports the estimation results for in-sample univariate predictive regressions for 10 book-to-market portfolios with media network index over the period of 2001:01–2014:12. Affirming our findings for the market portfolio in Table 2, ΔMCI_t^{opt} substantially enhances the return forecasting performance relative to AC_t across majority groups, with the R^2 about two to three times higher than the corresponding R^2 of AC_t.

In addition, almost all of the regression slope estimates for ΔMCI_t^{opt} are negative, thus the negative predictability of change of media connection for subsequent stock returns are pervasive across book-to-market portfolios. The regression slope estimates and R^2 statistics vary significantly across book-to-market groups, illustrating large cross-sectional difference in the exposures to media network index.

Indeed, high book-to-market portfolios are the most predictable by media network, whereas the low value stocks present the lowest predictability. The remaining panels of Table 6 show that ΔMCI_t^{opt} improves sharply the forecasting performance relative to AC_t for the cross-sectional stock returns of size, and momentum, industry, investment and profitability portfolios as well. In addition, all the R^2 statistics of ΔMCI_t^{opt} are much larger than the corresponding R^2 of AC_t. For example, the R^2 of ΔMCI_t^{opt} for high profitability portfolio is 0.04, while the corresponding R^2 of AC_t is 0.01.

In conclusion, consistent with the literature, there is a fairly large dispersion of regression slope estimates in the cross-section. Stocks that are small, distressed (high book-to-market ratio), with high growth opportunity (low book-to-market ratio), or past winners are more predictable by media connections.

4 Conclusions

This paper documented that the change of aggregated news tones for media connected stocks have the ability to predict future market excess returns. Specifically, we propose a novel measure for aggregate market risk from the media network angle. Our methodology allows us to identify information provided by news articles beyond just news coverage and investor sentiment. Based on the media connection index constructed, we find that the change of aggregate media connection based on news tones predicts a negative return with a higher in-sample and out-of-sample performance than average correlation index in Pollet and Wilson (2010). We also find the predictability of our measure mainly comes from the negative new tones which is consistent with Tetlock (2007) in which he find negative tones are more informative.

In addition, our findings are also statistically as well as economically significant even though we control for different economic predictors used in Goyal and Welch (2008). We have also tested the performance of our index in predicting returns during the recession and expansion periods documented by NBER. The results shows that our measure obtain larger and positive R^2s in recession periods comparing to average correlation measure. This result indicates that our measure possesses different predictive information with just news coverage and average correlation.

Lastly, we test the portfolio implications of media connection index across different investors with various risk aversion levels as well as different trading strategies. The empirical results show that the portfolios constructed based on media connection index obtain larger Sharpe ratios and certainty equivalent return gains than average correlation for mean-variance investors. It also shows that the stocks that are small, distressed (high book-to-market ratio), with high growth opportunity (low book-to-market ratio), or past winners are more predictable by media connections, which indicates a strong predictive power as well.



Figure 1: This figure plots the Media Network Index and Pollet and Wilson (2010) Average Correlation. The solid line depicts the Media Network index, constructed from the Thomson Reuters News Analytics dataset. The dashed line depicts the Pollet and Wilson (2010) average return correlation index. Both indices are standardized to have zero mean and unit variance. The vertical bars correspond to NBER-dated recessions. The sample period is 1996:01–2014:12



Figure 2: This figure depicts the excess market return forecasts of Media Network Index and Pollet and Wilson (2010) Average Correlation Index. The dotted red line depicts the out-of-sample predictive regression forecast for excess market return based on the previous month Media Network Index. The dashed blue line depicts the out-of-sample excess market return forecast based on Average Correlation Index. The excess market return forecasts are estimated recursively based on information up to the period of forecast formation period t alone. The vertical bars correspond to NBER-dated recessions. The out-of-sample period is 2000:01–2014:12



Figure 3: This figure depicts the difference between the cumulative squared forecast error (CSFE) for the historical average benchmark and the CSFE for the out-of-sample predictive regression forecast based on the previous month News Network Index. The dashed blue line depicts the difference between the CSFE for the historical average benchmark and the CSFE for the out-of-sample predictive regression forecast based on the Average Correlation Index. Both indices and regression coefficients are estimated recursively based on information up to the period of forecast formation period t alone. The vertical bars correspond to NBER-dated recessions. The out-of-sample period is 2000:01–2014:12.

Table 1: Summary Statistics

This table reports summary statistics for the log excess aggregate stock market return defined as the log return on the equal weight CRSP stocks in excess of the risk-free rate (R_m), risk-free rate (R_f), Media Network measures (based on optimism score, positive score and negative score respectively) with corresponding first order difference, Pollet and Wilson Average Correlation Index with its first order difference and 12 economic variables from Amit Goyals website: the log dividend-price ratio (D/P), the log dividend-yield ratio (D/Y), log earnings-price ratio (E/P), log dividend payout ratio (D/E), , book-to-market ratio (B/M), Treasury bill rate (TBL), long-term bond yield (LTY) long-term bond return (LTR), term spread (TMS), default yield spread (DFY), default return spread (DFR), stock return variance (SVAR). For each variable, the time-series average (Mean), standard deviation (Std. Dev.), skewness (Skew.), kurtosis (Kurt.), minimum (Min.), maximum (Max.), and first-order autocorrelation ($\rho(1)$) are reported. The monthly Sharpe ratio (SR) is the mean log excess market return divided by its standard deviation. The sample period is over 1996:01–2014:12.

	Mean	Std	Skew	Kurt	Min	Max	$\rho(1)$
R_m (%)	0.0066	0.0532	-0.4283	4.5904	-0.2103	0.1849	0.1709
R_f (%)	0.0023	0.0018	0.0477	1.4356	0.0000	0.0056	0.7451
MCI_t^{opt}	0.4798	0.1861	1.7008	6.4594	0.2654	1.3134	0.5907
MCI_t^{pos}	0.4927	0.0896	0.6649	3.4315	0.3255	0.8001	0.6632
MCI_t^{neg}	0.6660	0.3394	1.5194	5.3707	0.2000	1.9984	0.7047
ΔMCI_t^{opt}	0.0005	0.1442	0.4450	12.7742	-0.6881	0.8486	-0.3640
ΔMCI_t^{pos}	0.0012	0.0492	-0.1038	3.5210	-0.1416	0.1448	-0.3028
ΔMCI_t^{neg}	0.0011	0.2443	0.6457	13.0858	-0.9598	1.3559	-0.2723
AC_t	2.0631	0.9313	0.8844	3.6575	0.4669	4.9901	1.4640
ΔAC_t	0.0054	0.3561	0.3796	4.8268	-1.3030	1.3750	0.4999
D/P	-4.0513	0.2278	0.3652	3.7843	-4.5240	-3.2811	1.0780
D/Y	-4.0474	0.2267	0.2585	3.6326	-4.5313	-3.2948	0.9728
E/P	-3.1928	0.4263	-1.7005	6.7579	-4.8365	-2.5656	1.2934
D/E	-0.8585	0.4961	2.9080	11.8312	-1.2442	1.3795	1.5754
B/M	0.2555	0.0771	0.0950	2.0541	0.1205	0.4411	0.9550
TBL (%)	2.7027	2.0840	0.0238	1.3867	0.0100	6.1700	1.1495
LTY (%)	4.9904	1.1644	-0.4161	3.0346	2.0600	7.2600	1.0238
LTR (%)	0.7337	3.0785	0.0064	5.7393	-11.2400	14.4300	-0.0247
TMS (%)	2.2877	1.4041	-0.0827	1.7428	-0.4100	4.5300	1.1122
DFY (%)	1.0313	0.4693	2.7638	12.2444	0.5500	3.3800	1.4193
DFR (%)	-0.0186	1.8979	-0.3835	8.7112	-9.7500	7.3700	0.0000
SVAR (%)	0.0036	0.0058	5.8563	47.9514	0.0004	0.0581	0.7795

Table 2: Forecasting Market Return with News Network

This table provides in-sample estimation results for the predictive regression of monthly excess market return on one of three proxies of lagged News Network Indices (optimism, positive and negative score respectively) and Average Correlation Indices. The sample period is 1996:01–2014:12.

$$R^m_{t+1} = \alpha + \beta \Delta MCI^k_t + \epsilon_{t+1}, \quad k \in \{opt, pos, neg\},$$

where R^m_{t+1} denotes the monthly excess market return (%).

	Beta	t-stat	R^2	R^2_{up}	R^2_{down}
Panel A: Media Network Index					
ΔMCI^{opt}_t	-0.85	-2.41	2.53	1.32	4.10
ΔMCI^{pos}_t	-0.26	-0.76	0.25	0.14	1.25
ΔMCI^{neg}_t	-0.69	-2.02	1.80	1.16	2.86
Panel B: Average Correlation Index					
AC_t	0.60	1.76	1.37	3.35	1.03
ΔAC_t	-0.28	-0.82	0.30	0.09	1.44

Table 3: Comparison with Economic Return Predictors

This table provides in-sample estimation results for the bivariate predictive regression of monthly excess market return on one of the 12 economic predictors or Average Correlation Indices, Z_t, and on the one of lagged News Network Indices (optimism, positive and negative score respectively). The sample period is 1996:01–2014:12.

$$R^m_{t+1} = \alpha + \beta \Delta MCI^k_t + \phi Z_t + \epsilon_{t+1}, \quad k \in \{opt, pos, neg\},$$

where R^m_{t+1} denotes the monthly excess market return (%) The t-statistics of the coefficients are reported in the parenthesis.

	Optimism News Network			Positive News Network			Negative News Network		
	β	ϕ	R^2	β	ϕ	R^2	β	ϕ	R^2
AC_t	-1.18	0.63	0.04	-5.42	0.61	0.01	-3.35	0.63	0.01
	(-2.35)	(1.57)		(-0.71)	(1.50)		(-2.19)	(1.58)	
ΔAC_t	-1.10	-0.44	0.03	-6.72	-1.23	0.01	-6.72	-1.23	0.01
	(-2.10)	(-0.40)		(-0.87)	(-1.15)		(-0.87)	(-1.15)	
D/P	-1.16	2.21	0.04	-5.58	2.25	0.01	-5.58	2.25	0.01
	(-2.31)	(1.35)		(-0.73)	(1.36)		(-0.73)	(1.36)	
D/Y	-1.11	2.78	0.04	-5.84	3.05	0.02	-5.84	3.05	0.02
	(-2.21)	(1.70)		(-0.76)	(1.84)		(-0.76)	(1.84)	
E/P	-1.15	-0.35	0.03	-5.65	-0.52	0.00	-5.65	-0.52	0.00
	(-2.28)	(-0.40)		(-0.73)	(-0.58)		(-0.73)	(-0.58)	
D/E	-1.13	0.73	0.03	-5.78	0.85	0.01	-5.78	0.85	0.01
	(-2.25)	(0.96)		(-0.75)	(1.12)		(-0.75)	(1.12)	
B/M	-1.17	2.18	0.03	-5.40	1.99	0.00	-5.40	1.99	0.00
	(-2.31)	(0.45)		(-0.70)	(0.40)		(-0.70)	(0.40)	
TBL	-1.15	-0.09	0.03	-5.55	-0.11	0.00	-5.55	-0.11	0.00
	(-2.28)	(-0.52)		(-0.72)	(-0.63)		(-0.72)	(-0.63)	
LTY	-1.15	-0.29	0.03	-5.59	-0.31	0.01	-5.59	-0.31	0.01
	(-2.29)	(-0.89)		(-0.73)	(-0.95)		(-0.73)	(-0.95)	
LTR	-1.19	0.12	0.03	-4.95	0.10	0.01	-4.95	0.10	0.01
	(-2.36)	(0.97)		(-0.64)	(0.79)		(-0.64)	(0.79)	
TMS	-1.16	0.01	0.03	-5.51	0.04	0.00	-5.51	0.04	0.00
	(-2.30)	(0.04)		(-0.71)	(0.15)		(-0.71)	(0.15)	
DFY	-1.16	0.02	0.03	-5.56	0.11	0.00	-5.56	0.11	0.00
	(-2.31)	(0.02)		(-0.72)	(0.14)		(-0.72)	(0.14)	
DFR	-1.12	0.27	0.04	-6.48	0.32	0.02	-6.48	0.32	0.02
	(-2.23)	(1.39)		(-0.84)	(1.58)		(-0.84)	(1.58)	
SVAR	-1.10	-99.95	0.04	-5.60	-112.82	0.02	-5.60	-112.82	0.02
	(-2.18)	(-1.54)		(-0.73)	(-1.73)		(-0.73)	(-1.73)	

Table 4: Out-of-sample Forecasting

This table reports the out-of-sample performances of various measures of News Network Indices in predicting the monthly excess market return. Panel A provides the results using the 3 News Network Inices while Panel B are generated by using Pollet and Wilson (2010) Average Correlation Index. All of the predictors and regression slopes are estimated recursively using the data available at the forecast formation time t. R^2_{OS} is the Campbell and Thompson (2008) out-of-sample R^2. DM-test is the modified Diebold and Mariano (2002) t-statistic and CW-test is the Clark and West (2007) MSFE-adjusted statistic. $R^2_{OS,up}$ ($R^2_{OS,down}$) statistics are calculated over NBER-dated business-cycle expansions (recessions). The out-of-sample evaluation period is over 2000:01–2014:12.

	R^2_{OS}	CW	p-Value	DM	p-Value	$R^2_{OS,up}$	$R^2_{OS,down}$
Panel A: Media Network Index							
ΔMCI_t^{opt}	5.14	1.75	0.04	1.06	0.14	-0.59	11.85
ΔMCI_t^{pos}	-3.40	-2.03	0.98	-2.18	0.99	-2.67	-4.27
ΔMCI_T^{neg}	5.22	1.83	0.03	1.18	0.12	0.88	10.30
Panel B: Average Correlation Index							
AC_t	-9.92	-1.67	0.95	-2.45	0.99	-10.13	-9.66
ΔAC_t	-7.33	-2.56	0.99	-2.83	1.00	-8.57	-5.88

Table 5: Asset Allocation Implication

This table reports the portfolio performance measures for a mean-variance investor with a risk aversion coefficient (γ) of 1, 3 and 5, respectively, who allocates monthly between equities and risk-free bills using the out-of-sample forecasts of the excess market returns based on lagged News Network Indices, ΔMCI_t^{opt}, ΔMCI_t^{pos} and ΔMCI_t^{neg} respectively. AC_t is Pollet and Wilson (2010) Average Correlation Index and ΔAC_t is its first order difference. CER gain is the annualized certainty equivalent return gain for the investor and the monthly Sharpe ratio is the mean portfolio return in excess of the risk-free rate divided by its standard deviation. The portfolio weights are estimated recursively using the data available at the forecast formation time t. The out-of-sample evaluation period is over 2000:01–2014:12.

	No Transaction Cost				50pbs Transaction Cost			
Predictor	Sharpe Ratio	P_{SR}	CER gain	P_{CER}	Sharpe Ratio	P_{SR}	CER gain	P_{CER}
Panel A: Risk Aversion $\gamma = 1$								
ΔMCI_t^{opt}	0.21	0.01	4.04	0.00	0.19	0.02	3.49	0.00
ΔMCI_t^{pos}	0.09	0.36	1.20	0.04	0.08	0.45	0.94	0.08
ΔMCI_t^{neg}	0.17	0.03	3.15	0.00	0.14	0.06	2.59	0.00
AC_t	0.09	0.26	1.40	0.02	0.09	0.29	1.27	0.04
ΔAC_t	0.05	0.80	0.11	0.50	0.03	0.88	-0.30	0.74
Panel B: Risk Aversion $\gamma = 3$								
ΔMCI_t^{opt}	0.21	0.01	2.58	0.00	0.19	0.02	2.00	0.00
ΔMCI_t^{pos}	0.08	0.37	-0.86	0.92	0.07	0.47	-1.13	0.96
ΔMCI_t^{neg}	0.17	0.03	1.52	0.00	0.14	0.07	0.94	0.06
AC_t	0.08	0.40	-1.11	0.96	0.07	0.47	-1.28	0.98
ΔAC_t	0.05	0.77	-1.96	1.00	0.03	0.86	-2.36	1.00
Panel C: Risk Aversion $\gamma = 5$								
ΔMCI_t^{opt}	0.21	0.01	1.85	0.00	0.19	0.02	1.25	0.01
ΔMCI_t^{pos}	0.08	0.41	-1.95	1.00	0.07	0.51	-2.24	1.00
ΔMCI_t^{neg}	0.17	0.03	0.70	0.12	0.14	0.07	0.10	0.45
AC_t	0.08	0.41	-2.14	1.00	0.07	0.49	-2.34	1.00
ΔAC_t	0.05	0.76	-3.02	1.00	0.03	0.85	-3.43	1.00

Table 6: Forecasting Cross-sectional Portfolios with Media Connection Index.

This table reports in-sample estimation results for predictive regression

$$R^j_{t+1} = \alpha_j + \beta_j S_t + \epsilon^j_{t+1},$$

where S_t stands for ΔMCI^{opt}_t and AC_t. R^j_{t+1} is the monthly excess returns (in percentage) for the 10 industry, 10 book-to-market, 10 size, and 10 momentum portfolios, respectively. We report the slopes, Newey-West t-statistics, as well as the R^2. Portfolio returns (%) are value-weighted and available from Kenneth Frenchs data library. The sample period is over 1996:01–2014:12.

Predictor	ΔMCI^{opt}_t			AC_t		
	β	t-stat	R^2	β	t-stat	R^2
Panel A: Book-to-market portfolios						
Growth	-0.53	-0.94	0.00	1.06	1.94	0.02
2	-0.71	-1.48	0.01	0.75	1.61	0.01
3	-0.72	-1.70	0.01	0.56	1.34	0.01
4	-0.95	-2.31	0.02	0.55	1.37	0.01
5	-0.89	-2.27	0.02	0.45	1.17	0.01
6	-0.99	-2.62	0.03	0.34	0.91	0.00
7	-0.99	-2.80	0.03	0.09	0.25	0.00
8	-0.96	-2.67	0.03	0.07	0.19	0.00
9	-0.87	-2.34	0.02	0.05	0.12	0.00
Value	-1.29	-2.85	0.03	-0.03	-0.06	0.00
Panel B: Size portfolios						
Small	-0.87	-1.91	0.02	0.22	0.49	0.00
2	-1.14	-2.36	0.02	0.56	1.17	0.01
3	-1.11	-2.42	0.03	0.74	1.65	0.01
4	-0.95	-2.14	0.02	0.73	1.68	0.01
5	-0.90	-2.03	0.02	0.72	1.67	0.01
6	-0.71	-1.75	0.01	0.79	2.00	0.02
7	-0.80	-2.02	0.02	0.55	1.41	0.01
8	-0.78	-2.00	0.02	0.62	1.61	0.01
9	-0.70	-1.95	0.02	0.57	1.63	0.01
Big	-0.54	-1.60	0.01	0.64	1.95	0.02

Table 6 (Continued): Forecasting Cross-sectional Portfolios with Media Connection Index.

This table reports in-sample estimation results for predictive regression

$$R^j_{t+1} = \alpha_j + \beta_j S_t + \epsilon^j_{t+1},$$

where S_t stands for ΔMCI^{opt}_t and AC_t. R^j_{t+1} is the monthly excess returns (in percentage) for the 10 industry, 10 book-to-market, 10 size, and 10 momentum portfolios, respectively. We report the slopes, Newey-West t-statistics, as well as the R^2. Portfolio returns (%) are value-weighted and available from Kenneth Frenchs data library. The sample period is over 1996:01–2014:12.

Predictor	ΔMCI^{opt}_t			AC_t		
	β	t-stat	R^2	β	t-stat	R^2
Panel C: Momentum portfolios						
Loser	-1.12	-1.54	0.01	1.25	1.76	0.01
2	-1.15	-2.38	0.02	0.74	1.57	0.01
3	-1.18	-3.00	0.04	0.65	1.68	0.01
4	-0.88	-2.53	0.03	0.33	0.96	0.00
5	-0.90	-2.79	0.03	0.24	0.76	0.00
6	-0.76	-2.45	0.03	0.32	1.05	0.00
7	-0.83	-2.74	0.03	0.23	0.76	0.00
8	-0.79	-2.49	0.03	0.16	0.53	0.00
9	-0.75	-2.15	0.02	-0.00	-0.00	0.00
Winner	-0.82	-1.68	0.01	-0.05	-0.11	0.00
Panel D: Industry portfolios						
NoDur	-0.96	-2.65	0.03	0.36	1.02	0.00
Durbl	-1.57	-3.23	0.04	0.53	1.09	0.01
Manuf	-1.11	-2.57	0.03	0.44	1.04	0.00
Enrgy	-0.97	-1.55	0.01	-0.28	-0.46	0.00
HiTec	-0.64	-0.96	0.00	0.79	1.23	0.01
Telcm	-1.11	-1.76	0.01	1.23	2.02	0.02
Shops	-1.19	-2.72	0.03	0.68	1.57	0.01
Hlth	-0.54	-0.97	0.00	0.51	0.96	0.00
Utils	-0.32	-1.26	0.01	0.04	0.16	0.00
Other	-0.97	-2.99	0.04	0.10	0.32	0.00

Table 6 (Continued): Forecasting Cross-sectional Portfolios with Media Connection Index.

This table reports in-sample estimation results for predictive regression

$$R^j_{t+1} = \alpha_j + \beta_j S_t + \epsilon^j_{t+1},$$

where S_t stands for ΔMCI^{opt}_t and AC_t. R^j_{t+1} is the monthly excess returns (in percentage) for the 10 industry, 10 book-to-market, 10 size, and 10 momentum portfolios, respectively. We report the slopes, Newey-West t-statistics, as well as the R^2. Portfolio returns (%) are value-weighted and available from Kenneth Frenchs data library. The sample period is over 1996:01–2014:12.

Predictor	ΔMCI^{opt}_t			AC_t		
	β	t-stat	R^2	β	t-stat	R^2
Panel E: Investment portfolios						
Low	-1.03	-1.74	0.01	0.41	0.71	0.00
2	-1.08	-2.55	0.03	0.32	0.76	0.00
3	-1.13	-3.16	0.04	0.25	0.71	0.00
4	-0.89	-2.62	0.03	0.21	0.64	0.00
5	-0.83	-2.51	0.03	0.16	0.50	0.00
6	-0.84	-2.51	0.03	0.16	0.50	0.00
7	-0.82	-2.33	0.02	0.20	0.58	0.00
8	-0.90	-2.42	0.03	0.22	0.59	0.00
9	-0.78	-1.89	0.02	0.44	1.08	0.01
High	-0.75	-1.33	0.01	1.04	1.91	0.02
Panel F: Profitability Portfolios						
Low	-0.86	-1.41	0.01	0.67	1.13	0.01
2	-0.99	-2.57	0.03	0.30	0.79	0.00
3	-0.85	-2.32	0.02	0.19	0.53	0.00
4	-0.91	-2.62	0.03	0.24	0.70	0.00
5	-0.99	-2.93	0.04	0.24	0.70	0.00
6	-0.88	-2.66	0.03	0.22	0.67	0.00
7	-0.83	-2.43	0.03	0.22	0.66	0.00
8	-0.83	-2.44	0.03	0.29	0.86	0.00
9	-0.88	-2.43	0.03	0.34	0.97	0.00
High	-1.17	-2.96	0.04	0.46	1.19	0.01

References

Acharya, V. V., Pedersen, L. H., Philippon, T. and Richardson, M. (2017). Measuring systemic risk. *Review of Financial Studies*, **30** (1), 2–47.

Baker, M. and Wurgler, J. (2006). Investor sentiment and the cross-section of stock returns. *Journal of Finance*, **61**, 1645–1680.

— and — (2007). Investor sentiment in the stock market. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, **21**, 129–152.

—, — and Yu, Y. (2012). Global, local, and contagious investor sentiment. *Journal of Financial Economics*, **104**, 272–287.

Boudoukh, J., Michaely, R., Richardson, M. and Roberts, M. R. (2007). On the importance of measuring payout yield: Implications for empirical asset pricing. *The Journal of Finance*, **62** (2), 877–915.

Busetti, F. and Marcucci, J. (2013). Comparing forecast accuracy: a monte carlo investigation. *International Journal of Forecasting*, **29** (1), 13–27.

Campbell, J. Y. and Hentschel, L. (1992). No news is good news: An asymmetric model of changing volatility in stock returns. *Journal of financial Economics*, **31** (3), 281–318.

— and Thompson, S. B. (2008). Predicting excess stock returns out of sample: Can anything beat the historical average? *Review of Financial Studies*, **21** (4), 1509–1531.

Chen, C., Härdle, W. and Okhrin, Y. (2017). Tail event driven networks of sifis. *Working Paper*.

Chen, C. Y., Chiang, T. C. and Härdle, W. K. (2016). Downside risk and stock returns: An empirical analysis of the long-run and short-run dynamics from the g-7 countries. *Working Paper*.

Chen, Z. and Petkova, R. (2012). Does idiosyncratic volatility proxy for risk exposure? *Review of Financial Studies*, **25** (9), 2745–2787.

Clark, T. E. and West, K. D. (2007). Approximately normal tests for equal predictive accuracy in nested models. *Journal of econometrics*, **138** (1), 291–311.

Cohen, L. and Frazzini, A. (2008). Economic links and predictable returns. *The Journal of Finance*, **63** (4), 1977–2011.

DeMiguel, V., Garlappi, L. and Uppal, R. (2009). Optimal versus naive diversification: How inefficient is the 1/n portfolio strategy? *Review of Financial Studies*, **22** (5), 1915–1953.

Diebold, F. X. and Mariano, R. S. (2002). Comparing predictive accuracy. *Journal of Business & economic statistics*, **20** (1), 134–144.

Ferreira, M. A. and Santa-Clara, P. (2011). Forecasting stock market returns: The sum of the parts is more than the whole. *Journal of Financial Economics*, **100** (3), 514–537.

Goyal, A. and Welch, I. (2008). A comprehensive look at the empirical performance of equity premium prediction. *Review of Financial Studies*, **21** (4), 1455–1508.

Härdle, W. K., Wang, W. and Yu, L. (2016). Tenet: Tail-event driven network risk. *Journal of Econometrics*, **192** (2), 499–513.

Hillert, A., Jacobs, H. and Müller, S. (2014). Media makes momentum. *Review of Financial Studies*, **27**, 3467–3501.

Hong, W. T., H. and Valkanov, R. (2007). Do industries lead stock markets? *Journal of Financial Economics*, **83**, 367–396.

Huang, D., Jiang, F., Tu, J. and Zhou, G. (2014). Investor sentiment aligned: A powerful predictor of stock returns. *Review of Financial Studies*, p. hhu080.

Jegadeesh, N. and Wu, D. (2013). Word power: A new approach for content analysis. *Journal of Financial Economics*, **110** (3), 712–729.

Jobson, J. D. and Korkie, B. M. (1981). Performance hypothesis testing with the sharpe and treynor measures. *The Journal of Finance*, **36** (4), 889–908.

Kandel, S. and Stambaugh, R. F. (1996). On the predictability of stock returns: an asset-allocation perspective. *The Journal of Finance*, **51** (2), 385–424.

Kelly, B. and Pruitt, S. (2013). Market expectations in the cross-section of present values. *The Journal of Finance*, **68** (5), 1721–1756.

Lettau, M. and Ludvigson, S. (2001). Consumption, aggregate wealth, and expected stock returns. *the Journal of Finance*, **56** (3), 815–849.

McCracken, M. W. (2007). Asymptotics for out of sample tests of granger causality. *Journal of Econometrics*, **140** (2), 719–752.

Memmel, C. (2003). Performance hypothesis testing with the sharpe ratio. *Working Paper*.

Menzly, L. and Ozbas, O. (2010). Market segmentation and cross-predictability of returns. *The Journal of Finance*, **65** (4), 1555–1580.

Özgür, A., Cetin, B. and Bingol, H. (2008). Co-occurrence network of reuters news. *International Journal of Modern Physics C*, **19** (05), 689–702.

Pollet, J. M. and Wilson, M. (2010). Average correlation and stock market returns. *Journal of Financial Economics*, **96** (3), 364–380.

Rapach, D., Strauss, J., Tu, J. and Zhou, G. (2015). Industry interdependencies and cross-industry return predictability. *Working Paper*.

Rapach, D. E., Strauss, J. K. and Zhou, G. (2010). Out-of-sample equity premium prediction: Combination forecasts and links to the real economy. *Review of Financial Studies*, **23** (2), 821–862.

Scherbina, A. and Schlusche, B. (2015). Economic linkages inferred from news stories and the predictability of stock returns. *Working Paper*.

Tetlock, P. C. (2007). Giving content to investor sentiment: The role of media in the stock market. *The Journal of Finance*, **62** (3), 1139–1168.

—, Saar-Tsechansky, M. and Macskassy, S. (2008). More than words: Quantifying language to measure firms' fundamentals. *The Journal of Finance*, **63** (3), 1437–1467.

Wang, Y., Zhang, B. and Zhu, X. (2016). The momentum of news. *Working Paper*.

Xu, X., Chen, C. Y.-H. and Härdle, W. K. (2016). Dynamic credit default swaps curves in a network topology. *Working Paper*.

Zhang, J. L., Härdle, W. K., Chen, C. Y. and Bommes, E. (2016). Distillation of news flow into analysis of stock reactions. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, **34** (4), 547–563.